

MOHAMED H. MAHMOUD,^a PIOTR ZMYŚLONY^b

Evaluating Nighttime Governance Structures: Implications for Urban Policy in Night Mayor and Consultative Body Models

Abstract. The rise of night mayors and other nighttime governance bodies represents an emerging model of urban governance. Vibrant nightlife scenes have become central to the identity and economy of global cities. However, the complex needs of nightlife stakeholders pose unique governance challenges. In response, some cities have instituted specialized offices of night mayor to oversee nighttime economic policy. This goal of this article is to examine this solution as a unique governance approach and compare the roles of night mayors to other nighttime consultative bodies like councils, commissions, panels, and boards. Taking into account all kinds of utility derived from nighttime activities, externalities, and stakeholders needs, the author differentiates night mayors' concentrated leadership from the broader representation of advisory panels. It turns out that night mayors provide centralized oversight, while councils offer grassroots expertise. By working together they can create holistic strategies tailored to nighttime economies.

Keywords: nighttime economy, night mayor, nighttime governance, nighttime policies, nightlife externalities

Article history. Submitted 2024-07-31. Accepted 2024-08-17. Published 2024-09-02.

1. Introduction

The rise of night mayors and other nighttime governance bodies represents an important and emerging model of urban governance and has been recognized as a key factor in the ascension of nightlife as a relevant field of study (Straw, 2018). Vibrant nightlife scenes have been increasingly contributing to the identity, economic development, and culture of global cities (Chatterton & Hollands, 2002; Picaud, 2019). Entire neighborhoods thrive off of nighttime activities like

^a Poznan University of Economics and Business, Trade and Marketing, Mohamed.Mahmoud@phd.ue.poznan.pl, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9022-2966>

^b Poznan University of Economics and Business, International Business and Economics, Piotr.Zmyslony@ue.poznan.pl, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1168-0254>

restaurants, bars, clubs, live music, and other forms of entertainment that drive tourism, employment, artistic expression, and local tax revenues. Studies estimate that the nighttime economy accounts for billions in annual revenues across major cities and accounts for a significant percentage of jobs (NYC's Nightlife Economy, 2019; DC.gov, 2020; URBACT, 2023). However, as many nightlife researchers indicate, the complex and sometimes conflicting needs of various nightlife stakeholders present unique challenges for municipal governance. Issues like noise complaints, overcrowding, crime, accessibility, sustainability, and work-life balance need to be addressed with coordinated policies designed to balance economic growth with community livability (Ivett et al., 2019; Hadfield et al., 2009; Chen, 2011) and should not be used as a pretext for strict policing and maintaining structures of social exclusion (Straw, 2018). In other words, urban issues after dark should be solved by promoting mediation rather than regulation (Gwiazdzinski, 2018).

The idea of a 'night mayor', which originated in Amsterdam in 2003 in response to noise complaints and concerns about the growing nightlife scene, became more widely known after Mirik Milan was formally elected as the city's first night mayor in 2012. These specialized offices aim to support sustainable nighttime economies through strategic management, advocacy, mediation, and diversity promotion (Seijas & Gelders, 2020). They signal the need for tailored 24-hour governance of cities that go beyond daytime models. In 2019 there were 43-night mayor and night-time advocacy organizations (Seijas & Gelders, 2020), most of which were situated in Europe and Northern America.

Recently, Seijas and Gelders (2020) shed light on what can be a valid way to replace or compliment the night mayor position. They distinguish four categories of bodies managing nighttime activities, which they call panels, commissions, boards, and councils.

However, current literature on night mayors remains limited predominantly to individual case studies, which analyze their duties, activities, and impacts in specific cities over initial short-term periods. More rigorous comparative analyses between the night mayor model and other consultative governance bodies like nightlife councils, commissions, and panels across multiple cities have been lacking. Key questions remain as to how sustainable the gains from night mayor policies are over time and following changes in political leadership relative to these other governance bodies.

This paper examines night mayors as an emerging model of nighttime governance and compares their roles and characteristics to other consultative governance bodies such as boards, councils, commissions, and panels. Taking into account factors such as consumer utility, externalities, and governance needs, the author

describes how night mayors aim to address issues compares their approach to that employed by other entities. Specifically, differences between night mayors and bodies like councils or commissions are analyzed in terms of composition, responsibilities, powers, stakeholders represented, and factors impacting implementation. The goal of this comparative analysis is to assess night mayors' capacities to cater for consumer needs while managing negative externalities and compare their performance to that of other consultative bodies. The author evaluates whether concentrated leadership under a night mayor is more effective than broader representation via councils and whether it always serves nighttime governance needs. The analysis is based on a review of the literature on night mayor and consultative models for comprehensive nighttime governance.

2. Methodology

This study is based on a review of the literature and uses comparative analysis to examine night mayors as an emerging model of nighttime governance and compare their roles to other consultative bodies such as boards, councils, commissions, and panels.

A comprehensive literature search in the Scopus database was conducted using a combination of keywords including “night mayor,” “nighttime economy,” “night-life governance,” “nighttime advisory bodies,” and related terms. This final search yielded 28 relevant papers that were analyzed in detail.

Papers were selected based on their relevance to nighttime governance models, with emphasis on night mayors and other consultative bodies. Empirical studies and theoretical papers were included to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the field. The majority of the selected papers were published between 2015 and 2023, reflecting the relatively recent emergence of formalized nighttime governance structures. However, we also included seminal works from earlier years that laid the foundation for understanding nighttime economies and governance, ensuring a comprehensive historical perspective on the topic.

A systematic comparison of night mayors and other consultative bodies (panels, commissions, councils, and boards) was conducted taking into account the following aspects:

- Primary focus areas
- Roles and responsibilities
- Representation and stakeholder engagement

- Organizational structure
- Examples from various cities

This analysis made it possible to identify the unique characteristics, strengths, and limitations of each governance model.

3. Nighttime Economy and Night Governance: The Conceptual Approach

Although there is no commonly accepted definition of the nighttime economy (NTE), it is usually described as “the various economic activities and businesses that primarily operate during the evening and night hours, typically from 6 p.m. until early morning.” (Son et al., 2023, p. 1). The NTE incorporates all economic activity related to entertainment, leisure, food and drink, performance, events, festivals, and retail” (Chatterton & Hollands, 2003, p. 25). While this definition may seem to account for all aspects of the NTE, it is now considered to be outdated and incomplete. For instance, Shaw (2014) argues that in the majority of cases there the term “night-time economy” is overused as a synonym for “urban night” and actually refers to an “affective atmosphere, emerging from the arranging of practices, bodies and materials” (Shaw, 2014, p. 1).

The NTE concept first emerged in the UK in the 1970s and was popularized in the 1990s. At that time the term was used to refer to economic activity from 6pm to 6am the next day (Abraham et al., 2019). The specifics of the NTE vary between countries and locations, but generally the term encompasses businesses, industries and services associated with evening entertainment, leisure, and socializing needs (Aghasafari et al., 2021), for example nightlife venues (bars, clubs, pubs), restaurants, theaters, cinemas, music venues, casinos, hotels, and other hospitality establishments. It also includes transportation services, such as taxis, rideshares and public transit operating at night (Abraham et al., 2019), which can be grouped under the category of public services.

Chen et al. (2020) discussed how the nighttime economy can contribute to sustainable development in South Korea by enhancing city branding and attractiveness. The nighttime economy boosts economic growth through employment, tourism, and cultural development in urban and rural areas. Key goals of the NTE include creating a vibrant, inclusive, and safe nightlife environment that supports businesses, provides cultural experiences, and minimizes negative impacts, taking into account aspects of sustainability such as economic viability, social inclusivity,

environmental impact management, safety, urban planning integrating nightlife, and supportive policies (Madani & Carpenter, 2023). Sustained development of the NTE can improve community well-being and growth while maintaining a city's unique branding and appeal. Governments may implement policies to support the NTE while addressing issues like safety, transit, and noise (Chen, 2011).

Urban economies can be divided into formal and informal. While the formal sector is easier to oversee and tax, the informal sector provides income for marginalized groups. However, it is associated with issues like tax evasion and safety concerns. The complex balance between allowing informal activity and addressing its downsides is an ongoing challenge for nighttime economy governance. The ideal is to integrate the informal sector in a way that extends regulation while supporting livelihoods (Son et al., 2023). How formal and informal sectors interact is also evolving as the nighttime economy matures. Since workers and tourists come to use and enjoy a variety of goods and services provided by the NTE (Bianchini, 1995; Field, 2008), holistic and sustainable nighttime economy policies must account for both regulated and unregulated businesses to ensure the sustainable growth and development of the NTE (Field, 2008; Fu & Wang, 2021)

However, managing the complex array of stakeholders and issues surrounding nighttime activities presents unique challenges for city governments. In response to these challenges, some cities have created a new administrative position known as the “night mayor”, whose main responsibility is to exercise nighttime economy governance. One can therefore ask whether the position of a night mayor is the answer to cities' ongoing problems, such as noise pollution, crime, drugs, and alcohol excessive consumption, which are collectively known as externalities (Roberts & Gornostaeva, 2007; Van den Nouwelant & Steinmetz, 2013; Chatterton & Hollands, 2002; Roberts & Eldridge, 2009)

As stated earlier, this nighttime period is associated with social behaviors, economic transactions, governance challenges, and cultural meanings that differ from those observed during daytime. In order to analyze the NTE it is therefore necessary to examine the way in which temporally specific nighttime activities generate a unique utility, give rise to specific externalities and create particular governance needs. This requires definitions that determine boundaries of the NTE across the dimensions of time (when it starts and when it ends), space (which areas of the city are involved), its attributes (types of activity), and experiences (cultural meanings and social functions) (Roberts & Eldridge, 2009). When the NTE is investigated through these lenses, it is possible to discover the distinct rhythms, economic functions, and governance needs of urban nightlife.

Seijas and Gelders (2020) highlighted the evolution in nighttime research provided by Hadfield (2015). Studies conducted in the 1990s focused on the role of

nightlife in urban regeneration (Roberts & Gornostaeva, 2007). Research done in the 2000s responded to emerging issues like crime and congestion as nightlife proliferated. Recent research has been examining inclusive governance innovations that balance the risks and benefits of nightlife. This third wave focuses on inclusive nighttime governance, including the high-profile night mayor model pioneered in Amsterdam. The task of this official is liaising between residents, businesses, agencies, and other stakeholders to advocate, implement policies, address concerns, promote safety, and study best practices.

There is uncertainty regarding the institutionalization of night mayors. Cibin (2018) notes varying and potentially misleading roles defined as night mayors. Straw (2018) reveals differences in the origin and the evolution of European and North American night mayors. Confusion persists about their duties and authority, which differ depending on local contexts. In contrast to clear mandates of European night mayors, those in North America often have undefined responsibilities subject to municipal officials' whims. Though increasingly seen as important advocates, night mayors' success depends on local political support. Ongoing dialogue between Europe and North America will be critical to clarify best practices and establish night mayors as legitimate long-term positions.

As a designated authority overseeing the nighttime economy, a night mayor serves as a liaison between nightlife businesses, residents, city agencies, and other stakeholders and one of their main tasks is to promote the interests of venues, clubs, bars and the nightlife industry while also working to mitigate the negative impacts like noise, crime, and overcrowding, which can disturb communities.

Night mayors also promote policies and strategies to create a vibrant yet safe and sustainable nightlife environment. Their role involves mediating conflicts, communicating concerns, implementing regulations around licensing, zoning, sound and public services, and ensuring accessibility and diversity in nighttime activities.

The nature of the NTE and the night mayor's roles can be better understood by referring to three theories: the consumer utility theory, the theory of externalities and the governance theory. These three theories analyze nighttime economies from the perspective of consumer demand, wider community impacts, and the role of the state in managing this unique segment of urban economic activity.

3.1. Consumer Utility Theory

Nighttime activity is mainly motivated by the pursuit of human needs and experiential desires for leisure, amusement, cultural consumption, and socializing (Bianchini, 1995; Rowe, 2008). Urban nightlife satisfies important human needs

for entertainment, sensory pleasure, and hedonistic enjoyment that provide psychological rewards (Chatterton & Hollands, 2002; Tutenges, 2021).

It is essential to analyze consumer utility in order to understand the NTE and to design effective nighttime governance, as in the case of the night mayor model. In economics, consumer utility refers to the usefulness or enjoyment a consumer can derive from a service or good. From a microeconomics perspective, consumer utility helps explain consumer demand and behavior; Individuals seek to maximize their utility, or satisfaction, by consuming goods and services that provide them with the greatest possible benefit relative to their costs.

Consumer theory (Samuelson, 1938) “is concerned with how a rational consumer would make consumption decisions” (Levin & Milgrom, 2004, p. 1); it examines the satisfaction, benefits, and motivations that individuals derive from consumption of goods, services, activities, and experiences (Bovi, 2009). A key function of night mayors and nighttime governance is to maximize the utility people obtain from nightlife, while mitigating the negative effects, like residents’ sleep deprivation or disruption (Chatterton & Hollands, 2002). By invoking the concept of consumer utility one can explain why people engage in nighttime activities, how they evaluate costs and benefits, and how governance can shape nightlife utility. This provides an important framework that night mayors can use to manage and respond to nighttime economy consumers. By understanding consumer utilities and motivations, it is possible to pursue strategic governance that strikes a healthy balance between economic vibrancy and residents’ interests.

To understand the modern Western approach to urban planning and work-leisure pattern, it is instructive to examine the societal shifts that have occurred in recent decades. A few decades ago, major changes in society began reshaping the way cities were designed and how people structured their time between work and leisure. These changes laid the groundwork for many of the life-work patterns in urban settings that are commonly found in Western societies today. Looking back at the origins of these urban and lifestyle transformations helps shed light on how we got to our current state (Hadfield, 2015; Seijas & Gelders, 2020)

The shift from industrial to post-industrial society brought major changes to the work and leisure patterns; as industrialized societies became more automated and advanced in the postindustrial age, work became less physically demanding. Hours became more flexible, wages rose, and consumer goods became affordable for more people. Gradually, recreational activities and nights out became accessible to the working classes. Post-industrial societies enabled more varied, creative forms of leisure while also sometimes blurring the boundaries between work and leisure. As nighttime was increasingly being used for leisure activities, the cities were trying to adapt to this social shift by starting to revitalize economically through nightlife

entertainment (Roberts & Gornostaeva, 2007). Nowadays, cities are facing new problems connected with managing and governing night activities in an attempt to satisfy the conflicting needs of night activity seekers, workers and residents who have to deal with the externalities of nightlife.

Many cities recognize the importance of their nightlife and nighttime economy for branding and or as a promotional tool; for instance, New York proudly advertises itself as “the city that never sleeps” with its late-night restaurants, shows, and clubs; Las Vegas is known for its casinos and nightclubs along the Strip; New Orleans boasts numerous jazz clubs, Bourbon Street bars, and Mardi Gras parties. Cities like Miami, Austin, Chicago, and Tokyo also promote their bustling nightlife scenes. A vibrant nighttime economy attracts tourists, business conferences, and new residents (Roberts & Eldridge, 2009). Cities like these listed above benefit greatly in terms of revenue and image from branding themselves as nightlife destinations.

Nighttime activities and entertainment are essential elements of what is known as “experience economy” (Page & Connell, 2020). Visitors’ motivation to return to a given city depends on seven experiences variables: nighttime architecture, lighting, nighttime cruising, urban development and image, urban atmosphere, function, and emotion (Yu et al., 2022).

A recent study by Son et al. (2023) shows that the development of the NTE is mainly driven by activities to promote nightlife and the city, followed by improvements in infrastructure and safety, institutions, and the environment and, finally, nature and resources.

3.2. The Theory of Externalities

The NTE creates positive and negative externalities that must be recognized and dealt with (Roberts & Eldridge, 2009). On the one hand, nightlife generates cultural capital, tourism, and service economy jobs. On the other hand, negative externalities, like noise pollution, crime, congestion, trash, and conflicts between patrons and residents create social costs (Shaw, 2014; Chatterton & Hollands, 2002). Policies on zoning, licensing, sound, waste, and transport aim to maximize economic vibrancy and minimize negative impacts. However, the NTE also generates disutility by disrupting sleep patterns and rest for shift workers (Costa, 1996; Talbot, 2004), which may lead to errors while performing tasks or cause reduced performance (Caruso, 2014). There are also negative externalities produced by the consumption of alcohol (Roberts & Gornostaeva, 2007).

Managing the unavoidable conflict between those who seek nightlife fun and those who want to rest is a central challenge of nighttime governance. On the one

hand, the NTE offers evident benefits in the form of increased economic activity and tax revenue (Roberts & Eldridge, 2009); it enhances city branding and attractiveness (Chen et al., 2020), drives tourism (Shaw, 2014), and offers a greater variety of leisure options for residents (Chatterton & Hollands, 2003). Unfortunately, these benefits come at the cost of increased noise, traffic, and anti-social behavior late at night (Hadfield et al., 2009), extra spending on policing, public transport, street cleaning, etc. (Roberts et al., 2006), higher risk of alcohol-related violence and crime (Graham & Homel, 2009), and negative health impacts from alcohol consumption (Hughes et al., 2007).

The theory of externalities was analyzed both in neoclassical economy and in new institutional economics. The concept of externality was introduced in 1920 by the British economist Arthur Pigou, who defined it as a situation in which “one person A, in the course of rendering some service, for which payment is made, to a second person B, incidentally also renders services or disservices to other persons (not producers of like services) of such a sort that payment cannot be exacted from the benefited parties or compensation enforced on behalf of the injured parties” (Pigou, 1920 as cited in Hawkins, 2020). In his writings, Pigou tried to justify government intervention once externalities appeared.

Analyzing externalities is crucial for effective nighttime governance through models such as the office of a night mayor. The NTE generates significant negative externalities like noise, litter, congestion, crime, culture, and economic impact. While most studies on externalities are older than the concept of a night mayor and the NTE; one thing remains the same; “once an externality appears, an externality-reducing public policy should also take place” (Nagler, 2011)

Night governance bodies must strategically govern nightlife to maximize positive externalities like vibrancy and tourism revenue while mitigating negatives like disruption for residents. This highlights the need for interventions like soundproofing, zoning, waste management, public services, and community mediation. By understanding how nighttime businesses, consumers, and communities generate benefits and bear external costs, night mayors are able to develop balanced policies that can increase net social welfare. Insights gained from the theory of externalities can enable night mayors to strategically shape nighttime behavior and activities for the good of local communities.

3.3. Governance Theory

The term ‘governance’ appears in multiple academic disciplines including economics, geography, international relations, and political science (Bevir, 2010). It can be defined as interactions among structures, processes and traditions that determine

how power and responsibilities are exercised, how decisions are made and how citizens or other stakeholders have their say (Graham et al., 2003) Governance theory can therefore be understood as the practice of making collective decisions. It can therefore be concluded that the theory has both an explanatory power and an advisory character.

Governance theory can be helpful in analyzing innovations like the night mayor model. Despite increasing efforts to transform the legislative governance of urban public spaces, the evening and night-time economy retains its position at the top of 'community safety' agendas (Hadfield & Measham, 2015). The nature of nighttime activities requires governance tailored to the distinct cultures, rhythms, and social dynamics of nightlife (Gwiazdzinski, 2018). Conventional daytime governance approaches are often not sufficiently effective when dealing with unique night-time challenges, such as mediating conflicts, ensuring safety, supporting economic development, and managing disorder (Talbot, 2004; Shaw, 2014). The concept of governance helps to understand why standardized daytime models fail at night and how new context-specific governance solutions can create targeted policies suited to the temporal specificities of nightlife. Through this perspective, the office of a night mayor emerges as a novel form of networked nighttime governance that integrates key stakeholders (Seijas & Gelders, 2020).

Public governance of nightlife activities has traditionally fallen under the purview of local government agencies that often take a narrow approach focused on regulation and enforcement (Chatterton & Hollands, 2002). However, the emergence of night mayors and nightlife offices represents a shift toward a mixed governance model that incorporates nightlife stakeholders into policy and planning processes. With a collaborative approach, night mayors can give voice to diverse groups like venue owners, service workers, residents, police, transit, tourism bureaus, and more. Their coordinating role across agencies and sectors enables holistic strategies attuned to the complex needs of nighttime cities (Seijas & Gelders, 2020). Politicians may be able to authorize, fund and monitor, but often they cannot prioritize or give government agencies clear mandates or directions. So, managers need to fill this void at their operational level (Rhodes & Wanna, 2009).

Managers in this context can be understood as individuals hired for a specific role and vision. Effective nightlife governance requires an understanding of the various functions, responsibilities, and limitations associated with this role. Night mayors operate in a complex space between top-down government intervention and bottom-up industry initiatives. This middle position allows creative mediation between public and private interests. However, since night mayors lack formal authority, they require soft power tactics to influence stakeholders, raise issues, and enact change.

Venue owners, residents, regulators, consumers, tourism bureaus are all stakeholders and under the Stakeholder theory it suggested that effective governance requires balancing the needs and priorities of these diverse groups. A collaborative approach brings stakeholders together, giving them voice in policy decisions. This can lead to holistic strategies that align incentives, such as streamlining regulation to support business while addressing neighborhood impacts. Actively managing relationships and expectations between nightlife promoters, residents, police, regulators, and consumers can mitigate conflicts and find agreeable solutions. It is crucial to stress that failure to consider key stakeholder groups and their concerns can undermine compliance and success of policies. As an intermediary, night mayors can serve as a focal point bridging these interests (Seijas & Gelders, 2020).

3.4. Formal and Informal Power in the NTE

We can distinguish between formal actors in the NTE, such as municipal governments, urban planners, night mayors and other consultative bodies, and informal actors, such as nightlife entrepreneurs, community groups and cultural organizations which play an important role in shaping the urban night scenes. In their seminal book entitled *Planning the Night-time city*, Roberts & Eldridge (2009) explore how formal and informal powers interact with each other; Their interlinkage is characterized by:

- **Negotiation:** it is a known fact that formal authorities often need to negotiate with informal counterparts when it comes to policies implementation, for instance Nofre et al. (2018) highlighted how the conflicts arising from nighttime tourism in the city of Barcelona were managed when the local authorities engaged with the nightlife operators and residents groups.
- **Conflict:** on few occasions, tension between the two parties take place; Hadfield (2015) discusses how formal attempts to regulate nightlife often clash with established informal practices.
- **Collaboration** is another way of interaction between formal and informal powers with a view to creating an innovative solution for a given concern in the city. The office of a night mayor is a successful exemplification of this form of relationship since it shows how formal governance structures can adapt to include informal nightlife stakeholders.

4. Findings

The results of the study are presented in Table 1. The categories of nighttime governance bodies — Night Mayors, Panels, Commissions, Councils, and Boards — are analyzed from the perspective of their functionality and their primary roles within the nighttime economy, which helps to understand the diversity of structures and their specific purposes within urban governance. A distinction is made between different levels of authority and influence or area of involvement, starting with the Night Mayor at the top, who oversees the overall governance of the nighttime economy, and extending down to Panels, Commissions, Councils, and Boards, each with distinct levels of authority and influence.

While these bodies exist today, most, if not all of them, perform the functions of more than one governance body at the same time. For instance, the Melbourne nighttime economy advisory committee, according to my definition of core roles, is a commission, panel and council that provides evidence to local governance, gives recommendations, or advises and bridges the various stakeholders involved. This analysis is essential for grasping the nuances of each body and how they contribute to the overall management of the nighttime economy. The table is designed to represent the viewpoint of urban governance, focusing on how these bodies contribute to the management and regulation of the NTE within cities.

When evaluating these four governance bodies for the NTE through the theoretical lens of consumer utility, externalities, and governance, some appear better positioned to address each theoretical dimension. Commissions and Night Mayors, as direct representatives of the nightlife industry and consumer interests, can provide crucial insights into maximizing consumer utility and demand preferences. Councils, with their diverse membership spanning businesses, residents, law enforcement, and social services, are well-suited to facilitate discussions and develop strategies for managing both positive and negative externalities associated with nightlife activities. Meanwhile, Commissions and Panels, tasked with reviewing nightlife governance policies and providing expert advice to leadership, are most directly involved in evaluating and recommending effective governance frameworks. That said, there is likely overlap, with Boards advocating for reducing externalities impacting businesses, Councils weighing in on governance models, and Panels advising on economic utility considerations. Ultimately, a holistic and effective nightlife governance approach would leverage the unique perspectives offered by these different bodies to comprehensively address all three theoretical dimensions of consumer utility, externalities, and governance.

Table 1. Comparison of nighttime governance bodies

	Night Mayors	Panels	Commissions	Councils	Boards
Primary focus area	Nightlife Management	Nightlife management (advisory)	Nightlife management by conducting inquiries and providing strategic policy recommendations (policy, strategic) as well as advocating for business operators	Public safety, community relations	Advocating for business operators
Roles	Improving the physical environment and infrastructure for nightlife (Consumer utility theory (focuses on enhancing the nightlife experience for consumers) Updating policies and regulations around nighttime activity (governance) Mediating between different stakeholders in the nighttime economy (managing the externalities)	Provide evidence and information to local governance authorities like night mayors, managers and advisors. Act as a source to draw on and engage with regularly.	Specific purpose bodies for reviewing and reporting into the governance of the nighttime economy in cities. Can be ad hoc or continuing. Tend to formulate strategic initiatives and reforms.	Industry and citizenry engagement bodies that feed nighttime economy voices into local government. Have broad membership representing the voice of the nighttime economy. Operate on an ongoing basis.	Act as 'peak' nighttime economy representative structures emerging from outside local government administration. Often non-governmental initiatives with large and open membership
Representation	Typically act as champions or liaisons for the nightlife sector, representing their interests to the city government Typically represent and advocate for the interests of the nightlife industry and businesses.	Comprised of experts and specialist representatives from the nightlife sector who can provide evidence and advice to local authorities.	Often include representation from both the nightlife industry/ businesses as well as local government officials. Their aim is to provide policy advice to city leadership.	Represent a broader range of voices including nightlife businesses, residents/ community groups, law enforcement, health/social services. Their role is to convey these diverse perspectives to policymakers.	Tend to be industry-led and represent the interests of nightlife business owners, operators and professionals in that sector. They often emerge independently from local government.
Structure and form of organization	Various form exists today with most cases being a single institutionalizing individual working within the city hall, Or a nighttime economy office/ department within the city government to oversee and regulate the nighttime economy	Members are selected for expertise and technical knowledge. Structured as expert advisory committees.	Members are often appointed experts or stakeholders. Tend to have a fixed membership for duration of commission. Structured as time-limited or ongoing advisory panels.	Broad cross-section of stakeholders (including government, industry, community, and expertise) Organized as standing forums that meet regularly.	Draw from grassroots industries and nighttime community. Function as independent representative organizations.

	Night Mayors	Panels	Commissions	Councils	Boards
Legal authority and decision-making power	Focused on coordination and advocacy rather than direct decision-making power	Typically serve in an advisory capacity, they lack direct decision making, their influence comes from recommendations rather than legal authority.	They tend to have investigative powers and can make important policy recommendations. Some commissions also have regulatory authority	High legal authority and decision-making power	Significant legal authority within their specific domain of intervention, they can make binding decisions and, in some cases, have regulatory powers.
Examples	Night mayor of Amsterdam London's night czar Edmonton nighttime economy office Pittsburgh Nighttime economy Manager (part of mobility and infrastructure department)	Ghent Belgium: Nightlife council Ghent Sydney Australia: Nightlife and creative sector advisory panel Aberdeen UK: Night-time commission	New York USA: Nightlife advisory board Vienna Austria: Vienna club Commission Orlando USA: Downtown Nightclub taskforce Berlin clubcommission	Ghent Belgium: Nightlife council Ghent Montreal Canada: Night council Nantes France: Night council	Manchester UK: Nighttime economy panel Barcelona Spain: Comissio nocturna de Barcelona Geneva Switzerland: Grand council of the night Montreal Canada: Night council

Source: based on: Acuto et al., 2023; Seijas & Gelders, 2020; Nighttime Organization, 2023; Night Czar, n.d.; Cibin, 2021.

5. Conclusion

Nighttime governance has evolved over the past decades and since the introduction of the night mayor concept in Amsterdam in 2003, cities around the world have become aware of the need to balance the vibrant nighttime economy activities with safety and sustainability, which, consequently has led to the development of multiple consultative bodies and governance models.

Today, there is a diversity of approaches towards the management of nighttime activities:

- Night mayor: a person appointed by municipal authorities to oversee the nighttime economy, acts as a liaison between nightlife businesses and the local government. Their responsibilities include sustaining a vibrant, safe and sustainable nighttime economy.
- Advisory panels, commissions, councils and boards represent collective consulting bodies drawn from outside local government administration, they gather input, voice concerns and provide recommendations to the decisions-maker.

Each of the above models is used to institutionalize stakeholder involvement and integrate specialized knowledge into policy-making processes, for the purpose of creating a more inclusive and well managed nocturnal urban environment.

The models also represent a dynamic interplay of formal and informal power structures in shaping the urban night. While formal authorities frequently exercise decision-making power, informal networks and stakeholders have a lot of influence, which can be used in nighttime governance. The relationship between these two kinds of power structures is dynamic and is evolving in response to changing social standards, economic conditions, and urban growth patterns.

As cities continue to refine their approaches to nighttime governance; we can expect to see:

1. Increased recognition of nighttime as a unique area of urban policy and planning.
2. Increased inclusion of different stakeholders' voices in nighttime decision-making processes.
3. More tailored and beneficial policies that respond to the unique challenges and opportunities of the urban night.
4. Potential shifts in power dynamics between formal authorities and informal actors in urban governance.

Given that this field of research is still relatively new, the body of existing literature on the topic is still limited. Moreover, since most night mayor positions and similar governance bodies have functioned for a relatively short period of time, long-term impact studies are scarce. We acknowledge that the effectiveness of these governance models may vary based on local context and implementation.

CRediT Authorship Contribution Statement

Mohamed H. Mahmoud: writing-original draft, writing-review & editing, formal analysis, investigation, project administration. **Piotr Zmyslony:** conceptualization, supervision, review of draft

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

- Abraham, H., Scantlebury, D.M., & Zubidat, A.E. (2019). The loss of ecosystem-services emerging from artificial light at night. *Chronobiology International*, 36, 296–298.
- Acuto, M., Seijas, A., Edwards, A., & Bassett, S. (2023). Meeting afterhours: on the work that night commissions do. *Urban Geography*, 45(3), 372–389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2023.2180192>
- Aghasafari, H., Aminzadeh, M., Karbasi, A., & Calisti, R. (2021). CO2 Emissions, Export and Foreign Direct Investment: Empirical Evidence from Middle East and North Africa Region. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 30(7), 1054–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638199.2021.1892866>
- Bevir, M. (2010). Governance as theory, practice, and dilemma. In M. Bevir (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Governance* (pp. 1–16). SAGE.
- Bianchini, F. (1995). Night Cultures, Night Economies. *Planning Practice & Research*, 10(2), 121–126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459550036667>
- Bovi, M. (2009). Economic versus psychological forecasting. Evidence from consumer confidence surveys. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 30(4), 563–574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2009.06.002>
- Caruso, C.C. (2014). Negative impacts of shiftwork and long work hours. *Rehabilitation Nursing Journal*, 39(1), 16–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rnj.107>
- Chatterton, P., & Hollands, R. (2002). Theorising urban playscapes: Producing, regulating and consuming youthful nightlife city spaces. *Urban Studies*, 39(1), 95–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980220099096>
- Chatterton, P., & Hollands, R. (2003). *Urban nightscapes: Youth cultures, pleasure spaces and corporate power*. Psychology Press.
- Chen, N., Wang, Y., Li, J., Wei, Y., & Yuan, Q. (2020). Examining Structural Relationships among Night Tourism Experience, Lovemarks, Brand Satisfaction, and Brand Loyalty on “Cultural Heritage Night” in South Korea. *Sustainability*, 12(17), 6723. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12176723>
- Chen, N. (2011). Using luminosity data as a proxy for economic statistics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 108(21), 8589–8594. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1017031108>
- Cibin, A. (2018). Nightlife Neighborhood Conflicts in Zurich. Innovative Practice of Governance involving Night Ambassadors. *Bollettino Della Società Geografica Italiana*, 219–230. <https://doi.org/10.13128/bsgi.v1i2.537>
- Cibin, A. (2021). Forms of Night-Time Economy Governance: A Framework Towards Clarification. In H. Abusaada, A. Elshater, & D. Rodwell (Eds.), *Transforming Urban Nightlife and the Development of Smart Public Spaces* (pp. 22–39). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-7004-3.ch003>
- Costa, G. (1996). The impact of shift and night work on health. *Applied Ergonomics*, 27(1), 9–16. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870\(95\)00047-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-6870(95)00047-x)
- DC.gov. (2020). *Economic impact of DC's nightlife industry*. <https://communityaffairs.dc.gov/sites/moca/files/dc/sites/moca/publication/attachments/Nightlife-Economic-Impact-Report%20%281%29.pdf>
- Field, S. (2008). *Passing through Shanghai: Ethnographic insights into the mobile lives of expatriate youths*. Heidelberg University Publishing.
- Fu, C., & Wang, Y. (2021). Urban night-time tourism consumption space from the perspective of scene: A study based on the cultural scene of Super Wenheyoun in Changsha. *Wuhan University Journal (Philosophy and Social Science)*, 74(5), 58–70.

- Graham, J., Plumptre, T., & Amos, B. (2003). Governance principles for protected areas in the 21st century. Procon Ltd. *Information & Security: An International Journal*. <http://connections-qj.org/article/governance-principles-protected-areas-21st-century>
- Graham, K., & Homel, R. (2009). *Raising the bar: Preventing aggression in and around bars, pubs and clubs*. Routledge.
- Gwiazdzinski, L. (2018). The many facets of the urban night time. *Cities and Lighting*, 7, 23. <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01985765>
- Hadfield, P. (2015). The night-time city. Four modes of exclusion: Reflections on the Urban Studies special collection. *Urban Studies*, 52(3), 606–616. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098014543133>
- Hadfield, P., & Measham, F. (2015). The outsourcing of control: Alcohol law enforcement, private-sector governance and the evening and night-time economy. *Urban Studies*, 52(3), 517–537. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098014554540>
- Hadfield, P., Lister, S., & Traynor, P. (2009). ‘This town’s a different town today’: Policing and regulating the night-time economy. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 9(4), 465–485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895809343409>
- Hawkins, J. (2020). One Hundred Years Ago. The Book That Inspired the Carbon Price: Pigou’s The Economics of Welfare. *History of Economics Review*, 77(1), 61–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10370196.2020.1827759>
- Hughes, K., Anderson, Z., Morleo, M., & Bellis, M.A. (2007). Alcohol, nightlife and violence: the relative contributions of drinking before and during nights out to negative health and criminal justice outcomes. *Addiction*, 103(1), 60–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2007.02030.x>
- Ivett, I., Smith, M., Olt, G., & Berezvai, Z. (2019). Overtourism and the night-time economy: A case study of Budapest. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-04-2018-0028>
- Levin, J.D., & Milgrom, P.R. (2020). Consumer Theory. *Economics Primer*. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811217937_0004
- Madani, N.A., & Carpenter, D.O. (2023). Patterns of emergency room visits for respiratory diseases in New York State in relation to air pollution, poverty and smoking. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(4), 3267. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20043267>
- Nagler, M.G. (2011). Negative externalities, competition and consumer choice. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 59(3), 367–397. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6451.2011.00458.x>
- Night Czar. (n.d.). *London City Hall*. <https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/arts-and-culture/24-hour-london/night-czar>
- Nighttime Organization. (2023). <https://www.nighttime.org/>
- Nofre, J., Giordano, E., Eldridge, A., Martins, J. C., & Sequera, J. (2017). Tourism, nightlife and planning: challenges and opportunities for community liveability in La Barceloneta. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(3), 377–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2017.1375972>
- NYC’s Nightlife Economy. (2019). *NYC’s Nightlife Economy Impact, Assets, and Opportunities*. https://www.nyc.gov/assets/mome/pdf/NYC_Nightlife_Economic_Impact_Report_2019_digital.pdf
- Page, S.J., & Connell, J. (Eds.). (2020). *The Routledge Handbook of Events* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429280993>
- Picaud, M. (2019). Putting Paris and Berlin on show: Nightlife in the struggles to define cities’ international position. In G. Stahl, & G. Bottà (Eds.), *Nocturnes: Popular music and the night* (pp. 35–48). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99786-5_3
- Pigou, A.C. (1920). *The economics of welfare*. Macmillan. <https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/pigou-the-economics-of-welfare>
- Rhodes, R.A.W., & Wanna, J. (2009). Bringing the politics back in: Public value in Westminster parliamentary government. *Public Administration*, 87(2), 161–183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2009.01763.x>
- Roberts, M., & Eldridge, A. (2009). *Planning the night-time city*. Routledge.

- Roberts, M., & Gornostaeva, G. (2007). The night-time economy and sustainable town centres: Dilemmas for local government. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 2(2), 134–152. <https://doi.org/10.2495/SDP-V2-N2-134-152>
- Roberts, M., Turner, C., Greenfield, S., & Osborn, G. (2006). A continental ambience? Lessons in managing alcohol-related evening and night-time entertainment from four European capitals. *Urban Studies*, 43(7), 1105–1125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980600676615>
- Rowe, D. (2008). Culture, sport and night-time economy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(4), 339–415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630802445864>
- Samuelson, P.A. (1938). A note on the pure theory of consumer's behaviour. *Economica*, 5(17), 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2548836>
- Seijas, A., & Gelders, M.M. (2020). Governing the night-time city: The rise of night mayors as a new form of urban governance after dark. *Urban Studies*, 58(2), 316–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019895224>
- Shaw, R. (2014). Alive after five: Constructing the neoliberal night in Newcastle upon Tyne. *Urban Studies*, 51(4), 775–792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013499537>
- Son, N.N., Thu, N.T.P., Dung, N.Q., Huyen, B.T.T., & Xuan, V.N. (2023). Determinants of the sustained development of the Night-Time economy: the case of Hanoi, capital of Vietnam. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 16(8), 351. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm16080351>
- Straw, W. (2018). Afterword: Night mayors, policy mobilities and the question of night's end. In J. Nofre, & A. Eldridge (Eds.), *Exploring nightlife: Space, society and governance* (pp. 225–231). Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Talbot, D. (2004). Regulation and racial differentiation in the construction of night-time economies: A London case study. *Urban Studies*, 41(4), 887–901. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098042000194160>
- Tutenges, S. (2021). Nightlife ethnography: A phenomenological approach. In S.M. Bucarius, K.D. Haggerty, & L. Berardi (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of ethnographies of crime and criminal justice*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190904500.013.20>
- URBACT. (2023). *Cities after dark: exploring night-time urban dynamics*. <https://urbact.eu/cities-after-dark-exploring-night-time-urban-dynamics>
- Van den Nouwelant, R., & Steinmetz, C. (2013). Concentration vs. Dispersal of a Late-night Economy. *Spaces and Flows: An International Journal of Urban and ExtraUrban Studies*, 3(4), 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2154-8676/CGP/v03i04/53715>
- Yu, G., Tang, J., Na, J., & Ma, T. (2022). Nighttime as experiences: The influence of perceived value on urban waterfront night cruise loyalty. *SAGE Open*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221102431>

Ocena struktur zarządzania nocnego — implikacje funkcjonowania instytucji burmistrza nocnego i organów doradczych dla polityki miejskiej

Streszczenie. Rosnąca popularność instytucji burmistrza nocnego oraz innych organów zarządzania nocnego to przejaw nowego podejścia do zarządzania miejskiego. Tętniące życiem dzielnice, w których toczy się życie nocne, stały się centralnym elementem tożsamości i gospodarki miast globalnych. Jednak złożone potrzeby różnych grup uczestniczących w życiu nocnym stwarzają wyjątkowe wyzwania w zakresie zarządzania. W związku z tym niektóre miasta stworzyły specjalne urzędy burmistrza nocnego w celu nadzorowania polityki gospodarczej miasta w godzinach nocnych. W niniejszym artykule autorzy analizują to wyjątkowe podejście do zarządzania i porównują zadania burmistrza nocnego z rolą, jaką odgrywają inne organy doradcze odpowiedzialne za kształtowanie miejskiego życia nocnego, takie jak rady, komisje, panele i zarządy. Biorąc pod uwagę użyteczność, jaką wiąże się z różnymi formami aktywności w godzinach nocnych, jej różne konsekwencje i potrzeby interesariuszy, autorzy wyjaśniają, na czym polega różnica między skoncentrowanym w jednym

ręku przywództwem burmistrza nocnego a szerszą reprezentacją, jaką stanowią panele doradcze. Z badania wynika, że instytucja burmistrza nocnego zapewnia scentralizowany nadzór, podczas gdy inne organy doradcze oferują obywatelską wiedzę specjalistyczną. Współpracując, wszystkie te ciała mogą tworzyć holistyczne strategie dostosowane do specyfiki gospodarek nocnych.

Słowa kluczowe: gospodarka nocna, burmistrz nocny, zarządzanie nocne, polityka nocna, czynniki zewnętrzne życia nocnego



Copyright and license. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution — NoDerivates 4.0 International (CC BY-ND 4.0) License, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>